G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

~~57-03-4~~
57-03-4

Later references.

4704 18

1916.

(Inam)

File No. 709-16

Serial Nos. 1-3

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 — 3

Part B for Dec. (1).

SUBJECT.

Puja hak of Sri Anjaneya & other Temples at Baragur in the Chamarajapatna Taluk.

To Dy. Commr. Hassan vide No. 1359. dt 14.12.1)
forwards him a Copy of the G.O directing that the nominees of the appellant be allowed, if Competent to perform puja during her turn.

No. 1381-2 dt. 18.12.1). To Copies to — Appellant & Respondent.

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

D. R. Appadurai.
Br. VII dt. 22.12.17.

R. S. III—1] 1916.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Muzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 709-16

FILE HEADING.

Puja hak of Sri Anjaneya and other Temples at Barapur in the Chamarajapatna Taluk

From

The Dy. Commr., Hassan Dist,

No. 108 Dated 4.3.1917 Received

Diary No. 1695	Enclos. V.P. Spare Copies.	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Submits further report called for in docket No 1328 of 17.11.1903, in connection with the appeal petition of Venkatamma regarding the puja hak of the temple referd. to.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

*(put up).

The facts of the case are given at length in the office note of Muz. J. No. 51 of 1903.

Attention is invited to the genealogical tree given on the first page of the office note. One Channappiah was the pujari of one-fourth of

NOTES—First Sheet.

WD 1232—GPB—20,000—18-11-16

WD 1233—GPB—60,000—1 12-16—S

Serial No.

the share and died childless since 34 years ago. For 10 years after his death, his wife (apltt) Venkatamma's brother was the Pujari - As he was irregular in the conduct of worship, another hakdar to a fourth share by name Channaraya, father of the respt Channappiah was appointed the pujari - On Channarayas death, his son Channappiah succeeded. It is reported that there are no references to show that either the apltt Venkatamma's brother or any of his two successors was appointed by Govt to the Pujaship the cultivator of the lands having refused to pay the share of the pujaris to the respt Channappiah, he petitioned the local authorities who decided the question in favour of Venkatamma. The matter finally came up before the Dy. Commr who ordered that Channappiah - the respt - should not only continue to perform the puja but to receive the produce of the land in proportion to the share.

Against the foregoing order, Venkatamma has appealed to Govt -

Further information called for in this office Docket no. 1328 Dy 21-11-1903

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 1233—GPE—60 000—1 12-16—S

Serial No.

has been furnished in the letter under disposal.

May the case be posted for hearing, notices being issued to both the apltt and the respt?

Submitted for orders - This is a fourteen year old case.

W Cyn
11.7.17.

23/7/17

1) In the DCs order, the appts incompetence has been dwelt on as an additional reason for ordering lenant of inam land to give rent to Officiating pujari 2) the right of the appt to a share in the puja hak has been almost admitted vide i) Stt of respondent on 3.10.'98; ii) DCs order; and iii) her brother having officiated after her husbands death for 10 years.

The case may be posted.

Seen)

23/7/17

Mr
Lu
25/7

23/7

This is a regrettable case of losing sight and there has been no reminder on the part of the appellant though the appeal was filed more than 14 years ago. The last note about the appellant was in connection

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 1238—GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S

S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 709 of 1916

Serial No.

with a statement taken from her in 1907 & it is doubtful if she is still in the land of the living. If she is she seems to be entitled to a small allowance in recognition of her right to 6 1/4 share

(Dr. Meeker) 11.8.17

Notices not returned Served; Parties absent Bring up when Notices are received. Bo 21.8.17

Notices returned unserved, are submitted.

AD 23.8.17 23/8/17

Issue notices again 27/8/17

1445 8/10/17.

Order

2-11-17

WD 1233—GPB—60,000—1 12-16—S

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 709 of 191[illegible].

Serial No.

[illegible]

13/11/17

[illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet

13/11/17

13/11/17

WD 1233—GPB—60,000—1 12-16—S

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 709 of 1916

Serial No.

The applt is living and notices returned served are put up.

Office order and notice to the parties are issued for appl. or other orders.

[illegible] 7.11.17

Seen)

28 30.11.17

Appl. An enquiry must be made as to what action was being taken since this was that the Govt. were being pressed daily reminded to send up the report. Please put up a statement of the reminders sent and in what manner attended to who is responsible

Sd
30.11.17

(Routine note put up)

Issue and put up the information

Sd
1.12.17

2 No: 1359 dt 14.12.17, Govt of Haryana, for kind order of the Govt, directing that the honorees of the appeal be allowed, if competent, to perform the Hajj during his term

3 1381-2 dt 18.12.17, I the petitioner informs the above.

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

W.D. C244—GPB—6,00,000—19 5-16—S.

1916-17.

GEN. & REV. DEPTT. MYSORE
DIARY No. 1475
16 17
709-a
1

From

C. Venkata Rao Esq., B. A.,
Offg. Deputy Commissioner,

Hassan District.

To

D. M. Narasinga Rao Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
General Department,
Bangalore.

Dated 28 March 1917.

Despatched do

Received

General No. Ser C 108
No. 5

Enclosure No. one V.P. petition + one paper

Submitting further information on the petition of Venkata-ramana re the archakship of Sri Anjaneya Swamy and other temples of Bagur, Channarayapatna Taluk

Deputy Commissioner's Office, Hassan District.

Dated Hassan, 2nd March 1917.

From,

C. Venkata Rao Esquire, B. A.,

Offg. Deputy Commissioner,

Hassan District.

To,

D. L. Narasinga Rao Esquire, B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of

H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,

General Department,

Bangalore.

With reference to your docket No. 1328 dated 17/21st November 1903, calling for certain particulars in connection with the petition of Venkatamma, regarding the Puja hak of Sri Anjaneya and other temples of Bagur, Channaraipatna Taluk, I have the honor to state, that it is ascertained that there are no references to shew that either the appellant Venkatamma's brother Nardaiya or any of his two successors was appointed by Government to the Pujariship. Venkatamma has deposed that she herself appointed her own men after her husband's death and that she has no documentary evidence to support her enjoyment of the inam lands endowed to the temple. She further states that Channappaiya ordered to look after the duties on her behalf is the son of one Channaraya whom she did not nominate for the work.

2. The entire file of vernacular correspondence on the subject ending with the Channaraipatna Sub Division Officer's yadi No. 559 dated 20th November 1916, is forwarded herewith for reference and orders of Government.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Offg. Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.

RECEIVED
Date 30-4-03
REG. No. 1786
MUZRAI BRANCH

Two Rupee stamp affd.

Before the Government of Mysore Muzrai

appellant. Venkataramiah.

Respondent Channabasiyya

2594R
24-6-1903.

2 enclosures

259th

The appellant begs to appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Kadur dated the 18th day of April 1903 and the Assistant Commissioner of Kadur dated the 24th day of April 1903 and to state the following facts for the favourable consideration of Government:—

That it has been declared by the Committee of Management that the appellant's mother is the pujarini of the Anjaneya Temple and that she has been receiving the profits of the lands attached to the temple.

2. That since appellant's mother's death, the opposite party has continued to have the pujarini and enjoy the profits of the lands attached to the temple without any

in the twenty years.

3. That the Respondent is estopped from claiming the right to perform puja and enjoy the income of lands attached to the temple because it has derived an advantage in connection with those proceedings that he had to sue existing rights and to perform puja, income and

4. That even if he had such a right the Respondent's cause of action was not accrued during the life time of the defendant.

5. That in the year 1891, the Appellant's right to sue for a declaration that the disputed and suit lands attached to the temple was been vested after going into the case with the Inquiry Commissioner and duly confirmed all his rights thereto.

6. That no order of the Court of Chancery
[illegible] that [illegible] the
appellant has no power or
to not by law entitled to have
the [illegible] pursued in the Court
of the principles of [illegible] Law,
Equity, Justice and good [illegible].

7. That so long as the [illegible]
of appellant are [illegible] by
[illegible] with, no matter how [illegible]
[illegible] they are [illegible] pursued
against, the [illegible] has no
right to claim [illegible] the appellant
[illegible] her, contrary [illegible].

8. That [illegible] which are
on the appeal [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] the [illegible]
of the [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible].

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ $\frac{472}{248}$ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದ ಪ್ರತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದವರು

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ : ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದ ಪ್ರತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದವರು

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ $\frac{472}{248}$ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಸಾಲಪತ್ರದ ಪ್ರತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದವರು

ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಕೆ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್,
ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು,
ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಉಪವಿಭಾಗ,
ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ.

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ವಿಷಯ: ಕಾಕತಿ ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 142/3 ಮತ್ತು 142/4 ರಲ್ಲಿನ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಪಹಣಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ.

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಮನವಿ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವು ಕಾಕತಿ ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 142/3 ಮತ್ತು 142/4 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 3.75 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಕಾನೂನುಬದ್ಧ ಮಾಲೀಕರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ತಂದೆಯವರಾದ ದಿವಂಗತ ಬಸವರಾಜ ಗುರುಪಾದಪ್ಪ ಹಿರೇಮಠ ಅವರಿಂದ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರದ ಮೂಲಕ ನಾವು ಖರೀದಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವು ದಿನಾಂಕ 14-03-2019 ರಂದು ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಉಪನೋಂದಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಕಚೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಂದಣಿಯಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆದರೆ ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಹಳೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿದಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಬೆಳೆ ಸಾಲ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಹಾಗೂ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮಾರಾಟಕ್ಕೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ದಾಖಲಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿನಂತಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಮನವಿ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವು ಕಾಕತಿ ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 142/3 ಮತ್ತು 142/4 ರಲ್ಲಿನ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಪಹಣಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ. ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಮನವಿ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವು ಕಾಕತಿ ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 142/3 ಮತ್ತು 142/4 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 3.75 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಕಾನೂನುಬದ್ಧ ಮಾಲೀಕರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ತಂದೆಯವರಾದ ದಿವಂಗತ ಬಸವರಾಜ ಗುರುಪಾದಪ್ಪ ಹಿರೇಮಠ ಅವರಿಂದ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರದ ಮೂಲಕ ನಾವು ಖರೀದಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವು ದಿನಾಂಕ 14-03-2019 ರಂದು ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಉಪನೋಂದಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಕಚೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಂದಣಿಯಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆದರೆ ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಹಳೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿದಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಬೆಳೆ ಸಾಲ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಹಾಗೂ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮಾರಾಟಕ್ಕೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ದಾಖಲಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿನಂತಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಮನವಿ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವು ಕಾಕತಿ ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 142/3 ಮತ್ತು 142/4 ರಲ್ಲಿನ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಪಹಣಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ. ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಮನವಿ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವು ಕಾಕತಿ ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 142/3 ಮತ್ತು 142/4 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 3.75 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಕಾನೂನುಬದ್ಧ ಮಾಲೀಕರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ತಂದೆಯವರಾದ ದಿವಂಗತ ಬಸವರಾಜ ಗುರುಪಾದಪ್ಪ ಹಿರೇಮಠ ಅವರಿಂದ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರದ ಮೂಲಕ ನಾವು ಖರೀದಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರವು ದಿನಾಂಕ 14-03-2019 ರಂದು ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಉಪನೋಂದಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿ ಕಚೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಂದಣಿಯಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆದರೆ ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಹಳೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿದಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಬೆಳೆ ಸಾಲ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಹಾಗೂ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮಾರಾಟಕ್ಕೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಪಹಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ದಾಖಲಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿನಂತಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಅಂಗಡಿ ಮಾಲೀಕರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಗಡಿಯವನು ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಹೊಡೆದು ಗಾಯಗೊಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಆರೋಪಿಯು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯವಿರುವವನಾಗಿದ್ದಾನೆ. ಆರೋಪಿಯು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆರೋಪಿಯು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಆರೋಪಿಯನ್ನು ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ಆರೋಪಿಯು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರ

Dated
24.7.02

/Signed
D. Devaraj IAS.
Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

213

/Signed/
K. Chandy
2nd Grade Assistant Comm
Hassan Dist.

31/7/02

K. Chandy

Copy of the order by Vehicle Camera on 2-1-03
to be made ready for delivery on 26-1-03
to drive station
No. of words 305
Typing Fee Paper - 6-00 Copying Fee

[illegible]

[illegible] 1898

[illegible]

Signed

Amildar

Copy

Asst. Commissioner

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

123.R
11-7-1903



Before the Dewan of Mysore, Nuzrai

Enclosure

Nuzrai appeal No. 1786 of 1902-03.

appellant — Venkatamma

Respondent — Chennapayya

The appellant begs to ~~re~~submit the appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan with the explanation that the appeal is not out of time as directed in endorsement No. 2447 dated 2nd June 1903 herewith annexed:

1. Though the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan is dated the 24th July 1902, the appellant was not aware of it till it was actually executed that is on the 4th October 1902.

2. On the 9th October 1902 and 25th October 1902 the appellant applied for ~~a~~ Copy & endorsement of the said order for the purpose of appeal to Government, to the Taluk Cutcherry at Channarayapatna.

3. About the 24th December 1902 the appellant was directed to apply to the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan.

4 Application was accordingly made on the 16th January 1903 and the copies were ready on the 26th January 1903

5. Calculating from the date the appellant was made aware of the order i.e 4th oct 1902 to the date of presentation of the appeal ie to 23rd April 1903 the no. of days come to 201. Deducting 114 days from 201 days on account of delay in obtaining the Copy The appellant presented the appeal three clear days before the period of limitation.

6. The appellant humbly ventures to suggest that the law of limitation has not been made applicable to Munzar appeals.

7. The appellant further begs to submit that she being a helpless woman had to do everything without male assistance, travelling over distances by road markets.

W D 2594—GPB—2,000—7 4-16

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

APPEAL No. 1 OF 1917

APPELLANT.	RESPONDENT.
Venkatamma alias Puttamma wife of late Pujari Channappiah.	Channappiah son of late Pujari Channigraya.

SUBJECT.

Appeal against order No.71 dated 24th July 1908 of the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District, directing that the respondent Channappiah should continue to perform puja in Sri Kuliaeya Swami Temple at Chowdenahalli in the Channarayapatna Taluk, and receive the proportionate share of the produce of the inam lands attached to the institution.

DECISION.

The case was posted for hearing to 25th June 1917. Though notices were served on both the appellant and the respondent, the latter prayed for adjournment and the former was absent.

The right of the appellant to a share in the Puja [illegible] The respondent himself has deposed to this effect [illegible] as far back as 3rd October 1908. There is evidence [illegible] of her husband, the appellant got the Puja [illegible] of whom her brother was one, for upwards of 10 years. It [illegible] sumed that even the respondent and his father officiated [illegible] her own request. For, up till 27th July 1908, there was no order from any competent authority authorising the puja to be performed by the Respondent.

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 1 of 1917

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Venkatamma alias Puttamma wife of late Pujari channappiah.		Channappiah Son of late Pujari channaraya.

Subject.

Appeal against order no. 61 Dy 24th July 1902 of the Dy. Commr, Hassan Dist, directing that the respondent channappiah should ~~not only~~ continue to perform puja in Sri Anjaneya Swami Temple at chowdenahalli in the Channarayapatna Taluk, and receive the proportionate share of the produce of the inam lands attached to the institn.

Decision The case was posted for hearing to the 25-9-1917 when notices were ordered on both the applt and the respdt, the latter prayed for adjt

GPE—500—12-8-16

and the former was absent.

The right of the appellant to a share in the Puja here is indisputable. The respdt himself has deposed to this (Ex. K) effect before the Amildar so far back as 3rd Octr 1898. There is evidence that after the death of her husband, the apelt got the Puja performed by her own nominees of whom her brother was one, for upwards of 10 years. It must be presumed that even the respdt and his fathers officiated as Pujaris at her own request. For, up till 27th July 1902, there was no order from any Competent Authority authorising the puja to be performed by the Respdt.

Though the apelt is incompetent to perform the puja herself, being a woman, it is scarcely just or Equitable to deprive her of the right to a share in the Puja back which she must be allowed to enjoy

Though the appellant is incompetent to perform the puja herself, being a woman, it is scarcely just or equitable to deprive her of the right to a share in the Puja hak which she must be allowed to enjoy at least during her life time. There should be no objection to allow her nominees provided that they are otherwise competent to perform the puja during her turn. The appeal is allowed.

Memo No. 13 59/mwr 709-16-2 Bangalore, the 14th December 1917

Dated Bangalore, the 14th December 1917

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner Hassan District, with the observation that the inordinate delay of 14 years to report in the matter, is [redacted] dis-creditable. He is requested to report if the appellant is alive.

2. The records received with his letter No.178 dated 4th March 1917 are herewith returned.

By order,

Joint Secretary to Government.
Muzrai Department.

B.K.N.3

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

at least
during her life-time.
There should be no objection
to allow her nominees
provided that they are
otherwise competent to perform
the puja during her term.
The appeal is allowed.

Memo no. dy

Copy to the Dy. Commr.,
Hassan Dist, with the
~~above record returned with~~
~~his letter no 108 dy 4.3.1917~~
observation that the inordinate
delay of 14 years to report
led
in the matter, is
~~and~~ discreditable. ~~He~~ is reported
to report if the appellant is ~~not~~ alive.
(2) The record ~~read~~ with
his letter no 108 dy 4.3.1917
are herewith returned.

B.O.
16.11.17
Joint Secretary,
Revenue Dept.

Srikanta
may the order ~~may~~ be
printed.

Not necessary

DR

20/11/17 am 21.11.17

G. R. S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

B.O.

30.11.17

Joint Secretary

D(P)

30/11/17

Dept II

B.O.

30.11.17

Joint Secretary,

D(P)

30/11/17

Dept II

GPB—20,000—16-2-14